



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/991,036	11/20/2001	Richard Falk	EFIM0289	3634

31408 7590 08/17/2007
LAW OFFICE OF JAMES TROSINO
92 NATOMA STREET, SUITE 211
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

EXAMINER

THOMPSON, JAMES A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2625

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

08/17/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/991,036

Applicant(s)

FALK, RICHARD

Examiner

James A. Thompson

Art Unit

2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 April 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 7, 17-19, 23-26 and 30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 7, 17-19, 23-26 and 30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 November 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments, see Pre-Appeal Brief, filed 23 April 2007, with respect to the rejections of the claims under 35 USC §103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejections have been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, new grounds of rejection are made in view of newly discovered prior art.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. **Claims 1-2, 17-18 and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ringness (US Patent 6.456.395 B1).**

Regarding claims 1, 17 and 24: Ringness discloses providing a database comprising a spot color name (column 7, lines 30-35 of Ringness – *set of spot colors stored and used by DTP program*) associated with corresponding image data (column 3, lines 35-40 of Ringness – *colorimetric values of colors to be printed*); receiving a print job comprising page description language ("PDL") code (*Encapsulated Postscript ("EPS") is a form of page description language*) that includes a reference to the spot color name (column 6, lines 57-67 of Ringness – *spot color names and definitions located in DSC comments of the header portion of the EPS file*); identifying the spot color name in the PDL code (column 7, lines 12-23 of Ringness – *spot color names in DSC comments compared with spot color names used by DTP program*); retrieving from the database the corresponding image data associated with the identified spot color name (column 8, lines 15-35 of Ringness – *if spot color names match, colorimetric values retrieved; if not, similar values determined and retrieved*); adding PDL code to the print job for painting the retrieved image data as a PostScript pattern in the print job (column 7, lines 18-23 and column 9, lines 19-27 of Ringness – *color operators of Postscript code redefined by code inserted in the Postscript*

Art Unit: 2625

stream); executing the PDL code in the print job; and painting the retrieved image data as a PostScript pattern in the print job (figure 6(616) and column 14, lines 33-43 of Ringness – *modified EPS code executed by printer, thus painting the retrieved image data*).

Further regarding claim 24: Ringness discloses performing the method of claim 1 using a program storage medium readable by a computer, tangibly embodying a program of instructions executable by the computer (column 5, lines 44-54 of Ringness).

Further regarding claim 17: The database and modules comprising the apparatus of claim 17 correspond to the physically embodied portions of stored data and program codes executed by the computer in claim 24.

Regarding claims 2, 18 and 25: Ringness discloses that the image data are definable by a user (column 5, line 67 to column 6, line 11 and column 6, lines 20-30 of Ringness – *EPS files generated by user using desktop publishing software*).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 3, 19 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ringness (US Patent 6,456,395 B1) in view of Gass (US Patent 5,822,503).**

Regarding claims 3, 19 and 26: Ringness discloses providing a user interface (figure 1(40,42, 47) and column 11, lines 38-48 of Ringness) that allows a user to create, modify and/or delete the image data and the spot color name (column 6, lines 54-60 of Ringness – *since user creates and modifies EPS file, user creates, modifies and/or deletes image data and spot color names*).

Ringness does not disclose expressly providing a user interface that allows a user to create, modify, and/or delete the spot color pattern names *in the database*.

Gass discloses providing a user interface (figure 4 of Gass) that allows a user to create, modify, and/or delete the spot color pattern names in the database (column 6, lines 45-50 of Gass).

Ringness is combinable with Gass because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely processing and manipulation of color in digital page description language files. At the time of the

Art Unit: 2625

invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art provide in said user interface means by which a user may create, modify, and/or delete the spot color pattern names *in the database*, as taught by Gass. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user to be able to both define specific desired colors and patterns (column 6, lines 9-19 of Gass) and, with the knowledge of the minimum amount of separations required, print with as few separations as needed, thus reducing the overall printing cost (column 6, lines 25-31 of Gass). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Gass with Ringness to obtain the invention as specified in claims 3, 19 and 26.

6. Claims 7, 23 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ringness (US Patent 6,456,395 B1) in view of Hains (US Patent 6,262,811 B1).

Regarding claims 7, 23 and 30: Ringness discloses adding additional PDL code to the print job (column 7, lines 20-23 and column 10, lines 48-52 of Ringness – *prologue and epilogue code added to print job data stream*) to perform other tasks (column 12, lines 41-51 of Ringness).

Ringness does not disclose expressly that said other tasks include mirroring or four-way mirroring to prevent stitches from appearing in the printed output.

Hains discloses mirroring (column 3, lines 35-39 of Hains) or four-way mirror of halftone dot patterns (figure 8 and column 3, lines 39-46 of Hains). Using mirroring or four-way mirroring of halftone dot patterns naturally prevent printing artifacts such as stitching.

Ringness is combinable with Hains because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely how to best represent halftone patterns in printing to achieve more pleasing and accurate image representations. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use mirroring or four-way mirroring, as taught by Hains, for the image processing taught by Ringness. Since the digital image data processing taught by Ringness is performed by injecting page description language code, then the mirroring or four-way mirroring process performed by Hains would be performed by adding additional page description language code. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hains with Ringness to obtain the invention as specified in claims 7, 23 and 30.

Art Unit: 2625

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James A. Thompson whose telephone number is 571-272-7441. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David K. Moore can be reached on 571-272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JAT
09 August 2007

James A. Thompson
Examiner
Technology Division 2625



**DAVID MOORE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600**